MINUTES

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE VIRGINIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT BOARD

February 9, 2005 Richmond, Virginia

MEMBERS PRESENT: James F. McGuirk, II, Chairman

Jimmy Hazel Len Pomata

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Caine

John C. Lee, IV

OTHERS PRESENT: Lem Stewart, Commonwealth Chief Information Officer

Cheryl Clark, Deputy Chief Information Officer

Jerry Simonoff, VITA Strategic Management Services Director Dan Ziomek, VITA Associate Director for Project Management

Paul Lubic, VITA Associate Director for Policy, Practice

and Architecture

Mike Sandridge, VITA Project Management Division

(See Attached Attendance Log)

Call to Order

Mr. McGuirk called the Information Technology Project Review Committee meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. Following a roll call, Mr. McGuirk acknowledged that a quorum of the members was present.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. McGuirk called for approval of the minutes of the December 8, 2004 Committee meeting and the January 19, 2005 Committee Workshop meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the minutes of the December 8, 2004 and January 19, 2005 meetings of the IT Project Review Committee be approved as written. Seconded by Mr. Pomata, the motion carried unanimously.

Committee Administration and Staff Support

Mr. Dan Ziomek, Associate Director of the VITA Project Management Division (PMD), brought up an item from a previous meeting with regard to the Board's resolution concerning delegation of authority to the CIO. Board member Hiram Johnson had earlier requested extending the notification period to Board members for RFP's, development approvals, etc., from five to seven days.

Discussion followed on the possible impact of the request. Committee members agreed that the five day notification period should be retained in light of the electronic postings and additional information now being provided to Board members.

Committee members directed staff to retain the current five day notification period for RFP's, development approvals, etc.

Mr. Ziomek presented a schedule of upcoming Committee agenda items. He advised that the Committee, at their December meeting, requested the Board be given a briefing on the PPEA program and discussed additional PPEA milestones that were added to the schedule. After consulting with the PPEA Program Manager Fred Duball, staff proposed that an interim update on the PPEA program be given to the Board at their April meeting. Mr. McGuirk affirmed the importance of keeping the Board updated on the PPEA program.

Mr. Ziomek then presented a proposed schedule for Secretarial briefings as discussed at the Committee's January workshop. It was suggested that the Committee meet on March 16 and April 12 to receive the Secretarial briefings. Discussion followed.

STAFF ACTION: Committee members agreed to meet on March 16 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. and on April 12 at 1:00 p.m. to receive Secretarial briefings—four on each day. Committee members also agreed to hold their regular business meeting on the morning of April 13.

Mr. Ziomek presented a copy of the *Summary Action Plan for 2005* in response to the December 2004 Audit Report of VITA by the Auditor of Public Accounts. The plan lists tasks to address issues raised by the audit. Mr. Ziomek noted that the first seven items listed were most relevant to the work of the Committee and the Project Management Division. He advised that the Summary would be presented to the full Board by the Finance Committee at their afternoon meeting.

Mr. Ziomek then updated Committee members on a change that has been implemented under the direction of the CIO with regard to the processing of agency IT strategic plan amendments, procurements, and project requests for enterprise applications that may affect or be affected by the PPEA program. At the January workshop, staff proposed a change in the definition of "Identified for Preliminary Planning" (IPP), a category used in the RTIP report. Basically that definition was that the project has been identified as important to the agency, but they are not

ready to proceed at this time. The definition has been redefined to also indicate that an enterprise initiative is underway or under consideration that may have an impact on the project, and VITA wants to hold the project at this point in time. Mr. Ziomek noted that a communiqué would be sent out announcing this change to the agencies and the Governor's Cabinet.

Mr. Ziomek advised that a strategic plan amendment request had been received from the Department of Corrections for a financial system upgrade project, and advised that they would be asked to delay project planning in view of the current PPEA detailed review. The Department of Corrections will also be informed that, if they have a critical mission need, they may bring that need to the attention of the PMD and CIO for forwarding to the Committee for a final decision to proceed with project planning. Discussion followed.

Mr. Stewart noted that this enterprise view to project planning approval also applied to other areas where there exists a clear enterprise system solution or standard, such as licensing and geographic information systems.

Secretary of Transportation Briefing

Mr. Piece Homer, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, briefed Committee members on the responsibilities of developing and implementing Virginia's transportation program. Mr. Homer discussed the diverse elements to transportation in Virginia, such as security; roads; airports; ports in Hampton Roads; Dulles airport; and consumer issues.

Mr. Homer explained that six agencies made up the Transportation Secretariat—the Departments of Aviation; Motor Vehicles; Rail and Public Transportation; Transportation; the Motor Vehicle Dealer Board; and the Virginia Port Authority. These agencies employ more than 12,000 workers and have a combined annual budget in excess of \$3.3 billion.

Mr. Homer discussed the various services to citizens performed in the agencies and the revenue collections and revenue generation functions of some of the agencies. He pointed out that the agencies were unique in the financial management area because they dealt in large capital investments and with a six-year budget—setting them apart from other state agencies. He discussed the management of IT resources within the Transportation Secretariat.

Mr. Homer advised Committee members of the Secretariat's priority technology initiatives---DMV's Integrated Systems Redesign, and the Department of Transportation's Financial Management System II Upgrade, Phase I.

Mr. Homer presented the top five critical issues facing the Transportation Secretariat, emphasizing that the most important issue is adequate and sustainable funding for the Transportation program.

Discussion followed on the use of technology for interaction between citizens and the Department of Transportation. Responding to a question from Mr. McGuirk, Mr. Homer

confirmed that the Department of Transportation was one of the largest users of geographical information systems.

Enterprise Architecture Update

Mr. Paul Lubic, Associate Director, Policy, Practice and Architecture Division, briefed Committee members on the status of the Enterprise Architecture. He advised that the validation of the "as-is" Enterprise Business Architecture for 73 agencies had been completed and that analysis of the data was underway. He further advised that four of the eight Technical Architecture domains had been completed, including the Platform Architecture.

Mr. Lubic discussed issues related to the completion of the Enterprise Architecture—the need for input on the business vision and strategy, and a lack of staff resources. He noted that the other two Enterprise Architecture domains had not been started due to the lack of staff resources. Mr. Lubic advised that although the Governor's Budget Bill had included resources for three additional enterprise architects, both the House of Delegates and the Senate had recently removed those resources in their versions of the Budget. He advised that VITA leadership would be looking at other possible avenues of funding. Discussion followed on the importance of completing all of the Enterprise Architecture domains.

STAFF ACTION: Committee members directed that Mr. Lubic present to them at their April meeting, alternative plans for obtaining the necessary resources to complete all of the Enterprise Architecture domains.

Platform Architecture Policy

Mr. Lubic presented the Platform Architecture Policy and asked Committee members to recommend approval of the document to the IT Investment board. He advised the Committee that they had approved the Platform Architecture Report in March 2004. He noted that the purpose of the Platform Architecture Policy was to establish platform policy requirements which govern the acquisition, use and management of personal computing, server and storage technologies by Executive branch agencies. Mr. Lubic explained how the document was developed, as well as the goals and objectives of the policy. Discussion followed.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hazel that the Committee recommend approval of the Platform Architecture Policy to the IT Investment Board. Seconded by Mr. Pomata, the motion carried unanimously.

Independent Verification and Validation Review Report

STAFF ACTION: Due to a lack of time, Mr. McGuirk directed that the Independent Verification and Validation Review Report agenda item be postponed until the Committee's March meeting.

Major IT Projects Status Report

Mr. George Williams, Project Management Division, gave a status report on major information technology projects, noting changes that had been made to the report at the request of Committee members. He explained the status of selected projects, focusing on those rated red or yellow.

Recommended Technology Investment Projects Report

Ms. Constance Scott, Project Management Division, advised Committee members that the purpose of the presentation would be for them to review and confirm decisions made at the January RTIP Workshop and to review and approve the action items schedule, the RTIP Report schedule; and the Proposed Plan of Action.

Ms. Scott then presented a list of decisions made at the January workshop.

A brief discussion initiated by Len Pomata about the use of the term "unfunded projects" versus "recommended for funding" occurred. The action item is to use the phrase 'Recommended for Funding' instead of 'Unfunded' and to use to this term consistently in all documents.

In presenting the prioritization criteria, Mr. Ziomek asked for clarification of the Secretariat prioritization in the ranking process. It was his understanding that the Secretariat prioritization would be considered but not enforced. Committee members confirmed.

Committee members confirmed the decisions made at the January RTIP Workshop as presented.

Ms. Scott then reviewed the workshop action items schedule. Mr. McGuirk asked for clarification of the action items that would have to be taken to the Board in April. Following a discussion, Committee members requested changes to the workshop action items and associated dates.

Ms. Scott then reviewed the RTIP report schedule. Following a discussion of the target completion dates, Committee members recommended changes. It was agreed that staff would issue guidance on the RTIP report on April 14. It was decided not to submit the draft RTIP to the ITPRC first before submitting it to the ITIB. Committee members agreed that when the draft RTIP report is ready, it is to be sent electronically to all Board members for review. The target date for the draft is July 8th, with a mandatory date of July 15th.

Ms. Scott presented the proposed plan of action to obtain ITIB approval. Following a discussion about next steps, the Committee decided to ask the IT Investment Board to review the following:

- Decisions made by the Committee in the January RTIP workshop and their February meeting,
- RTIP Report Schedule
- Proposed RTIP 2005 Report Outline

- RTIP 2005 Report Summary of Changes, Deletes, Adds
- RTIP Desired outcomes
- Proposed Plan of Action
- Committee Workshop Action Items

The Board members will be asked to notify the Chairman of the IT Project Review Committee of any questions or concerns regarding this material within the next seven days. In addition, PMD is to submit a revised draft of the Preliminary Business Case questions, scoring and evaluation criteria, and the Secretariat prioritization process and criteria prior to the March ITPRC meeting. A formal discussion and review of this material will take place at the March ITPRC meeting. All of these items will be submitted to the Board for approval at their April meeting.

Statewide IT Strategic Plan Update

Mr. Jerry Simonoff, Director of Strategic Management Services, advised Committee members that the full Board would briefed on plans to update the Statewide IT Plan at their afternoon meeting.

Other Business

No other business was discussed.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:26 p.m.

These Minutes were approved by IT Project Review Committee on March 16, 2005.

ATTENDANCE LOG

<u>Name</u> <u>Affiliation</u>

Paul Doty EGI
Dan Keene EGI
Fred Norman CVC

Karen Helderman Auditor of Public Accounts
Jackie Principe Auditor of Public Accounts

Fred Franklin VCCS
Rob Jones Trebor Gray
Matt Benedetti Capital Strategies

Edward Vincent Dept. of Social Services

Chris Chappell APA
Deborah Vaughan VDSS
C.W. Laugerbaum Indigetech
Ben Lewis CGF AMS
Pat Sweethan CGF AMS
Don Parr Bearing Point

H. F. Jones

Rod Willett North Highland

Tom Bradshaw VITA Diane Wresinski VITA Judy Marchand **VITA Patty Samuels VITA** Melissa Mutter VITA Linda Hening VITA George Williams VITA Constance Scott VITA

Roz Witherspoon VITA/ITIB